Group II: Claim 26, drawn to an oral medicinal composition comprising an oil composition;

Group III: Claims 27-33, drawn to a food comprising the oil composition;

Group IV: Claims 40-48, drawn to a method of inhibiting platelet-aggregation in a mammal with an oil composition; and

Group V: Claims 49 and 50, drawn to a salad dressing.

Applicants elect, with traverse, Group I, Claims 6-25, 34 and 35, for further prosecution.

Applicants note that the claims of Groups II-V are directly dependent from the claims of Groups I, and as such these groups are not separable.

MPEP §803 states: "Examiners must provide reasons and/or examples to support conclusions." However, the Office has merely concluded that "the five inventions are independent and distinct, each from the other as they have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and a separate subject matter of inventive effort." The Office doesn't even provide a scintilla of a reason and/or example to support this assertion. In fact, as noted above, the claims of Groups II-V are directly *dependent* from the claims of Groups I. Moreover, Groups I, II, and IV and Groups III and V are classified in the same subclasses, respectively. Therefore, Applicants submit that the Office has not met the burden necessary to sustain this Restriction Requirement.

Further, MPEP §803 states as follows:

> If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on its merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

Applicants submit that a search of all claims would not constitute a serious burden on the Office, particularly in view of the fact that Groups I, II, and IV and Groups III and V are

classified in the same subclasses (class 514, subclass 558 and class 426, various subclasses, respectively).

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants contend that the Restriction Requirement is improper and should be withdrawn.

Additionally, MPEP §821.04 states:

> ...if applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined.

Applicants respectfully submit that should the elected group be found allowable, non-elected process claims should be rejoined.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for examination on the merits, and early notice of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Norman F. Oblon
Attorney of Record
Registration No.: 24,618

Vincent K. Shier, Ph.D.
Registration No.: 50,552

22850

PHONE NO.: (703) 413-3000
FAX NO.: (703) 413-2220
NFO:VKS
E:\217788US0CONT-RR resp.wpd

MARKED-UP COPY

IN THE CLAIMS

Please amend the claims as follows:

49. (Amended) A salad dressing comprising:

a) wine vinegar; and

b) the oil composition of Claim [5] 6[; and

c) said oil].